

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1 to 14, 17, 18, 20 to 28 and 30 to 58 are pending and rejected, with claims 15, 16, 19 and 29 having been previously cancelled. By this Response, claims 1 to 5, 7, 9 to 12, 14, 18, 20 to 28, 30, 37, 39 to 42, 47, 52 and 53 have been amended. No new matter was added by these amendments. Independent claims 1, 37 and 53 have been amended for clarity and to distinguish over the cited references. Support for these amendments is found at least at paragraph [0376] of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0172222. Claims 1 to 5, 7, 9 to 12, 14, 18, 20 to 28, 30, 37, 39 to 42, 47, 52 and 53 were amended for clarity and not to overcome any prior art. Applicants have submitted a Request for Continued Examination with this Response. Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for the Request for Continued Examination any amounts deemed due in connection with this Response.

Claims 1, 27 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants' representative discussed this rejection and proposed amended claim language during a telephone call with the Examiner on March 10, 2010. Claims 1, 27 and 37 have been amended as discussed during the call. In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 to 14, 17, 18, 20 to 28 and 30 to 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,364,834 to Reuss et al. ("*Reuss*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,057,758 to Dempsey ("*Dempsey*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in light of the claims as presented. Applicants' representative discussed the amendments to independent claims 1, 37 and 53 during the March 10, 2010 call with the Examiner. The Examiner indicated a further search would be required in furtherance of the concurrently filed Request for Continued Examination, but that the amendments appear to overcome the presently applied prior art.

Amended independent claim 1, for example, includes if the central computer determines that the first clinician's device is active, the central computer relaying the signal relating to the alarm or alert condition to the first clinician's device; the first clinician's device indicating the alarm or alert condition by displaying the specific patient's name and an alarm or alert icon related to the alarm or alert condition on a list interface which contains a list of all patients the first clinician is responsible for, including the specific patient, for which signals relating to alarm

or alert conditions have been sent to the first clinician's device and one of a plurality of different alarm or alert icons for each patient, wherein each patient name and corresponding icon is a hyperlink to a respective pump alarm details interface screen, *different alarm or alert icons are associated with different patient or first clinician tasks and each hyperlink is associated with a different color or shading to differentiate the level of urgency of attention required for each of the patients on the list.* Independent claims 37 and 53 have been similarly amended.

The Examiner referred to col. 8, lines 47 to 61 of *Dempsey* as disclosing a list interface which includes the names of all patients. Although this passage discloses a list of patients, and enables a physician to select a particular patient and pull up their information, *Dempsey* does not disclose a pump alarm details interface screen including *different alarm or alert icons associated with different patient or clinician tasks* and *hyperlinks each associated with a different color or shading to differentiate the level of urgency of attention required for each of the patients on the list.* *Reuss* does not remedy this deficiency. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 to 14, 17, 18, 20 to 28 and 30 to 58 are patentable over the combination of *Reuss* and *Dempsey* and in condition for allowance.

Applicants note that all amendments removing the word "causing", and changing "to [action]" to "acting" have been made mainly for readability and in no way to overcome the applied art or to disclaim any subject matter with respect to the same.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit reconsideration of same. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this Response.

Respectfully submitted,
K&L Gates LLP

BY



Matthew S. Dicke
Reg. No. 58,819
Customer No. 29200
312-578-5415

Dated: March 19, 2010